BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL, PRINCIPAL BENCH, NEW DELHI

Original Application No. 200/2014 (C.W.P. No. 3727/1985)

And

Original Application No. 501 of 2014 (M.A. No. 404 of 2015)

And

Original Application No. 146 of 2015

And

Appeal No. 63 of 2015

IN THE MATTER OF: -

M.C. Mehta Vs. Union of India & Ors.

And

Anil Kumar Singhal Vs. Union of India & Ors.

And

Society for Protection of Environment & Biodiversity & Anr.

Vs.

Union of India & Ors.

And

Confederation of Delhi Industries & CETP Societies
(An Organisation of CETP Societies)

Vs.

D.P.C.C. & Ors.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SWATANTER KUMAR, CHAIRPERSON

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE JAWAD RAHIM, JUDICIAL MEMBER

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAGHUVENDRA S. RATHORE, JUDICIAL MEMBER

HON'BLE MR. B<mark>IKR</mark>AM SINGH SAJWA<mark>N, EXP</mark>ERT MEMBER

HON'BLE DR. AJAY A DESHPANDE, EXPERT MEMBER

Present Applicant:

Mr. M.C. Mehta, Ms. Katyani and Ms. Mehak Tastogi, Advs.

Mr. Sanjay Upadhyay with Mr. Salik Shafique, Advs.

for Indian Chemical Council & Jubilant Life Sciences

Mr. B.V. Niren, Adv. for CGWA

Ms. D. Bharathi Reddy, Adv. for Uttarakhand UDA

Mr. S.A. Zaidi and Ms. Mansi Chahal, Adv. for Leather Industries

Mr. Narender Pal Singh, Adv. and Mr. Dinesh Jindal, LO, Delhi Pollution Control Committee and Mr. Prateek Gupta, Adv.

Ms. Akshita Sachdeva, Adv. for Teva API India Pvt. Ltd.

Mr. Motish Kumar Singh and Mr. Saurabh Sachdeva, Advs. for Noticee No. 653 (IFFCO)

Ms. Neelam Rathore, Adv. for Association of Textiles Processors & Uttar Pradesh Dyes & Bleachers Associations (Micro & Small) and MLA Group & Chamber of Indian Trade & Industry

Mr. Jayesh Gaurav, Adv. for JSPCB

Mr. Amit Agarwal and Ms. Asha N. Basu, Advs. for West Bengal Pollution Control Board

Mr. Rajul Shrivastav, Advs. for MPPCB

Mr. Mukesh Verma and Mr. Bikash Kumar Sinha, Advs. for UPCB

Mr. Sudhir Kulshrestha, Adv.

Ms. Priyanka Sinha, Adv. for State of Jharkhand

Mr. Atul Batra, Advs for Mother Dairy, Pilakhuwa Unit

Ms. Panchajanya Batra Singh, Adv for Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change

Ms. Sushma Singh, Adv.

Mr. Sanjeev Ralli, Adv. with Mr. Dinesh Jindal, LO, Delhi Pollution Control Committee

Mr. Suraj Prakash Singh, Adv. with Ms. Pushpila Bisht, Advs. for UPSMA & AIDA

Ms. Antima Bazaz, Adv. for AIDA and Jain Distillery
Ms. Antima Bazaz, Adv. for Mohit Petrochemical

Mr. V.K. Shukla, Adv. with Ms. Vijay Lakshmi, Advs. for State of Madhya Pradesh

Mr. Ravi P. Mehrotra and Mr. Abhinav Kr. Malik, Advs. for UPSIDC

 $\mbox{Mr.}$ Gautam Singh for Mr. Rudreshwar Singh, Advs. for State of Bihar and \mbox{BSPCB}

Mr. Ishwer Singh, Adv., National Mission for Clean Ganga

Ms. Yogmaya Agnihotri, Adv. for C.E.C.B.

Ms. Alpana Poddar, Adv. and Mr. Bhupender, LA,

Central Pollution Control Board

Abhishek Yadav, Adv. for State of Uttar Pradesh

Respondent No.3: Mr. Pradeep Misra and Mr. Daleep Dhayani, Advs.

Mr. I.K. Kapila, Adv. for UP Jal Nigam & UK Pey Jal

Respondent Nos. 10 and 11:Mr. Ravindra Kumar, Adv. SPENBIO Respondent:

Mr. Krishna Kumar Singh, Adv. for MoEF

Mr. Manoj Kumar, Adv. for Mr. Moni Cinmoy, Adv. for DSIIDC along with Mr. Vipin Kaushik, AEE, DSIIDC

I	Date and	Orders of the Tribunal
1	Remarks	
	Item Nos.	
	16 to 19	Most regretfully we notice that the assistance
A	February 27, 2017	provided by the Ministry of Water Resources and Uttar
	ss	Pradesh Jal Nigam is most ineffective. In fact they became
A	111-	party to the Joint Inspection and then pointed out before
V	E	the Tribunal deficiencies in the joint inspection report.
W	0	The officer from the Ministry of Water Resources is not
	1 3	even present today.
		This case is being heard on day-to-day for its
	6	expeditiousness disposal in terms of the order passed by
	-	the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.
		Whatever questions are posed by us in relation to
		the details already submitted by the joint inspection team
		remained unanswered or we were compelled to advert for
		the counsel to take instructions. The documents passed
		from the bar to the bench are without any proper
		authentication, but they do create impediment in further
		hearing of the case and even the information which is
		patently not correct is furnished to the Tribunal. It take

Item Nos. 16 to 19 February 27, 2017 more time to the Tribunal to verify the content of the information supplied rather than to proceed further with the case and to bring the case almost in relation to Segment-B, Phase-I to its logical end.

In view of the above while giving clear direction to all the stakeholders and the Learned Counsel appearing for the parties that they should be prepared with complete arguments and documentation they have already filed in relation to 30 drains for which the case is being heard by the Tribunal day-to-day. We will not grant any adjournment and impose Rs. 25,000/- cost on Uttar Pradesh Jal Nigam and Ministry of Water Resources for the lapses afore-referred. This cost will be recovered from Mr. Ghanshyam Diwedi, officer of the Jal Nigam and the officers responsible from the Ministry of Water Resources who despite specific directions of the Tribunal have failed to appear before the Tribunal much less to produce relevant information.

The Learned Counsel appearing for the Ministry of Water Resources shall also state before the Tribunal as to why the Executive Director, Technical has not submitted the report for which he had taken 10 days time while he appeared personally before the Tribunal.

List these matters tomorrow i.e. on 28^{th} February, 2017.

	,CP
(Swatanter Kumar)	
	JM,
(Dr. Jawad Rahim)	

Item Nos. 16 to 19 February 27, 2017 ss	,JM (Raghuvendra S. Rathore),EM (Bikram Singh Sajwan)
	,EM (Dr. Ajay A Deshpande)

